

United States District Court
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION

DOMAIN PROTECTION, LLC,	§	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 4:18-cv-792
	§	Judge Mazzant
SEA WASP, LLC, ET. AL.	§	
<i>Defendants.</i>	§	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Domain Protection’s Motion for Withdrawal of May 22, 2020 Sanctions Award (Dkt. #409) and Counsel Gary N. Schepps’ Motion to Withdraw Sanctions (Dkt. #413). Defendants filed Defendant Sea Wasp, LLC’s Response to Domain Protection’s Motion for Withdrawal of May 20, 2020 Sanctions Award and Counsel Gary N. Schepps’ Motion to Withdraw Sanctions (Dkt. #419) on June 25, 2020. Having considered the motions and the relevant pleadings, the Court finds that both Motions are **DENIED**.

Motions to reconsider serve a very limited purpose: “to permit a party to correct manifest errors of law or fact, or to present newly discovered evidence.” *Krim v. pcOrder.com, Inc.*, 212 F.R.D. 329, 331 (W.D. Tex. 2002) (citations omitted). Mere disagreement with a district court’s order does not warrant reconsideration of that order. *Id.* at 332. A party should not restate, recycle, or rehash arguments that were previously made. *Id.* District court opinions “are not intended as mere first drafts, subject to revision and reconsideration at a litigant’s pleasure.” *Verdin v. Fed. Nat’l. Mortg. Ass’n*, No. 4:10-cv-590, 2012 WL 2803751, at *1 (E.D. Tex. July 10, 2012) (citations omitted).

The Court has already considered Plaintiff’s arguments—which have been repackaged in Schepps’ Motion—and found them unpersuasive. Domain Protection and Schepps’ requests are accordingly denied.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff Domain Protection's Motion for Withdrawal of May 22, 2020 Sanctions Award (Dkt. #409) and Counsel Gary N. Schepps' Motion to Withdraw Sanctions (Dkt. #413) are hereby **DENIED**.

SIGNED this 29th day of June, 2020.



AMOS L. MAZZANT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE